

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Lewis J. Logan,) Case No. 8:23-cv-05220-DCC
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) **ORDER**
)
Steve Mueller,)
)
Defendant.)
_____)

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's complaint alleging violations of his civil rights. ECF No. 26. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On October 24, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that this action be dismissed. ECF No. 8. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences for failing to do so. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the Report and the time to do so has lapsed.¹

¹ The Court notes that Plaintiff filed a letter stating that he had not been receiving mail. ECF No. 11. In response, the Clerk of Court remailed the Report and reset the deadline for objections. Plaintiff has not responded.

APPLICABLE LAW AND ANALYSIS

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

As noted above, Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report; however, the Court did receive a letter from Plaintiff as discussed above. The Court is of the opinion that the letter cannot be considered objections; however, out of an abundance of caution for a pro se party, the Court has conducted a de novo review of the Report, the record, and the applicable law. Upon such review, the Court agrees with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. This action is **DISMISSED** without leave to amend and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.
United States District Judge

April 29, 2024
Spartanburg, South Carolina